arXiv:cond-mat/0102513v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 2 Mar 2001

On the critical temperature of two-channel Kondo model: Reply to cond-mat/0009283

I. L. Aleiner[1], B. L. Altshuler[2], and Y. M. Galperin[3]
[1] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, SUNY at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA,*
[3]*Physics Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA and NEC Research Institute,*
4 Independence Way, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA
[3]*Department of Physics, University of Oslo, P. O. Box 1048, N-0316 Oslo, Norway and Division of Solid State Physics,*
Ioffe Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg 194021, Russia
(February 28, 2001)

We discuss the comment by Zaránd and Zawadowski (cond-mat/0009283) on our preprint cond-mat/0007430 where it has been shown that the strong coupling regime for the two-channel Kondo model of two level system can be never realized for any realistic microscopic description. The authors of the comment state that the Kondo temperature can be substantially increased due to electron-hole asymmetry. Here we show by direct calculation that the electron-hole asymmetry does not enter the leading logarithmic approximation. Consequently, we disagree with the aforementioned comment.

Hereby we discuss the comment by Zaránd and Zawadowski[1] regarding our preprint[2] on the Kondo temperature, T_K, of the two-channel Kondo model based on a heavy particle in a double-well potential (DWP) (see Ref. 3,4 for a review). A serious deficiency of the original 2 channel Kondo (2CK) model was too small tunneling constant[5] calculated in leading logarithmic approximation turns out to be below 0.1 K Authors of Ref. 5 attempted to “cure” the situation by including virtual processes via the third excited state in DWP in hope that it would increase the tunneling amplitude.

In Ref. 2 we demonstrated that when *all of the exited states* are included *the Kondo temperature gets reduced even further.* It turns out that the Kondo logarithmic singularity should be cut-off by $\varepsilon_3 \sim \hbar t_{\rm tun} \ll \varepsilon_F$ Here ε_3 is the spacing between the second and the third levels in DWP, $t_{\rm tun}$ it the tunneling time, and ε_F denotes the Fermi energy. Note that long ago Kagan and Prokof’ev made a similar statement in connection with diffusion of heavy particles in metals. Since T_K is proportional to the cut-off and $\varepsilon_3 \ll \varepsilon_F$, the Kondo temperature turns out to be hopelessly small for the strong coupling 2CK limit to be achieved experimentally. Moreover, we found that the spacing between first two levels always exceeds T_K. This prevents realization of this strong coupling regime even in principle.[6] In Ref. 2 we emphasized the importance of taking into account all of the exited states as well as the fact that the exponential smallness of the tunneling probability cannot disappear.

Formally, this smallness follows from the cancellation of virtual contributions of different excited states. At the same time, the dramatic reduction of the cut-off and thus of T_K has a transparent physical reason. Indeed, the conventional Kondo Hamiltonian assumes infinitely quick spin flip. Therefore, the mapping of the DWP problem to the Kondo problem can be valid *only for energies below* $\hbar/t_{\rm tun}$ - inverse time, which the tunneling process takes. Otherwise one could imagine that the Kondo effect takes place for a heavy particle in an arbitrary potential, not necessarily a double-well one. The reason for the absence of the Kondo effect for, e.g., harmonic oscillator is that the spacing between the first two levels, Δ, is of the same order as $\varepsilon_3 \sim \hbar/t_{\rm tun}$. Only the energy interval $\Delta \ll \varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_3$ is available for the formation of the logarithmic singularity! The fact that $\varepsilon_F t_{\rm tun} \gg \hbar$ follows directly from the large mass of the tunneling particle. Indeed, the magnitude of DWP should be of the usual atomic order ~ 1 V. At the same time, the atomic mass exceeds the mass of an electron by about four orders of magnitude. Accordingly the tunneling time of an atomic particle, $t_{\rm tun}$ should be about two orders of magnitude longer than the electron tunneling time scale $\sim \hbar/\varepsilon_F$. *It is slow tunneling of heavy particles (rather than some electron-hole symmetry) that causes the suppression of the Kondo temperature.*

The authors of Ref. 1 try to revitalize 2CK model by including finite electron-hole asymmetry. Up to our understanding, they still do not fully appreciate the fact that the proper cut-off energy cannot exceed $\varepsilon_3 \ll \varepsilon_F$

Below we use an approach, which differs from Ref. 2 and show that both electron and hole contributions taken separately diverge logarithmically, the ultraviolet cutoff being ε_3 and, therefore, the prefactor in the expression for T_K has nothing to do with electron-hole asymmetry.

The second order corrections to the electron-assisted (δA_e) and hole-assisted (δA_h) tunneling amplitudes can be expressed through Matsubara Green functions of electrons and movable atoms, $G_e(\tau)$ and $G_{\rm at}(\tau; x_1, x_2)$, respectively:

$$\delta A_{e,h} \simeq \int_0^{1/T} d\tau \, G_{\rm at}(\tau; -a, a) G_e(\pm\tau) \,. \tag{1}$$

Here we omitted numerical prefactors, put $\hbar = 1$ and used the fact that $G_e(\tau) = G_h(-\tau)$. We also ignored the spatial coordinates and spin indices in $G_e(\tau)$. The Green function of the movable atom, $G_{\rm at}(\tau; x_1, x_2)$, is determined by the equation

$$\left[\frac{\partial_x^2}{2M} - \partial_\tau - U(x)\right] G_{\rm at}(\tau; x, x') = \delta(\tau)\, \delta(x - x') \,. \tag{2}$$

We assumed for simplicity that DWP, $U(x)$, is symmetric, i.e., $U(-x) = U(x)$, and has the two minima at $x = \pm a$. At $\tau < 0$ the Green function, $G_{at}(\tau)$, vanishes at $\tau < 0$, because, according to the model, there is only one movable defect. The asymptotic behavior of the electron Green function at $\epsilon_F \tau \gg 1$ is (omitting nonessential for present discussion constant factors)

$$G_{\rm el}(\tau) = \nu(\mu)\frac{\pi T}{\sin \pi T\tau} + \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}\left(\frac{\pi T}{\sin \pi T\tau}\right)^2 \operatorname{sign}\tau + \ldots \tag{3}$$

where $\nu(\mu)$ is the density of states at the Fermi level. The second term manifests the electron-hole asymmetry, whatever it means. Notice, that when τ increases, the second term decays *faster* than the first one. Therefore, this asymmetry becomes irrelevant at large enough τ. The τ -dependence of the DWP Green function, $G_{\rm at}$, (2) can be found in semiclassical approximation, which is valid for excited states as well as for the exponentially weak tunneling:

$$G_{\rm at}(\tau) = B(\tau)\exp\left[-S_{\rm cl}(x_1, x_2, \tau)\right], \tag{4}$$

where $S_{\rm cl}$ is the classical action of the particle in the inverted DWP:

$$S_{\rm cl}(x_1, x_2, \tau) = \int_0^\tau d\tau_1 \left[\frac{M}{2}\left(\frac{\partial x}{\partial \tau_1}\right)^2 + U(x)\right]; \tag{5}$$
$$\delta S/\delta[x(\tau_1)] = 0, \quad x(\tau_1 = \tau) = x_2, \quad x(\tau = 0) = x_1.$$

One can evaluate the prefactor $B(\tau)$ in Eq. (4). However, we do not need it here. We substitute $x_{1,2} = \pm a$ and rewrite Eq.(6) as

$$S_{\rm cl} = -\tau E(\tau) + \int_{-a}^{a} dx\sqrt{2M[E + U(x)]}\,. \tag{6}$$

Here $E(\tau)$-function is implicitly given by the equation

$$\tau = \int_{-a}^{a} dx\sqrt{\frac{M}{2[E + U(x)]}}\,. \tag{7}$$

It follows from Eq. (7), that there are two tunneling regimes, with different dependences $E(\tau)$. The crossover takes place at the time scale

$$t_{\rm tun} \equiv \int_0^a dx\left[\sqrt{\frac{2M}{U(x) - U(a)}} - \frac{1}{a - x}\sqrt{\frac{4M}{U''(a)}}\right]. \tag{8}$$

The quantity $t_{\rm tun} \sim \hbar/\varepsilon_3$ has a meaning of a typical time the particle spends under the barrier during the tunneling process. Using Eqs. (6) and (7) one can obtain the following asymptotics of S_{cl} at small τ

$$S_{\rm cl} = \frac{2Ma^2}{\tau} + \tau\int_{-a}^{a}\frac{dx}{2a}\,U(x) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2)\,. \tag{9}$$

Equation (9) holds for $\tau \ll t_{\rm tun}$. In the opposite case, $\tau \gg t_{\rm tun}$,

$$S_{\rm cl} = -\tau U(a) + \int_{-a}^{a} dx\sqrt{2M[U(x) - U(a)]}$$
$$+2\sqrt{ma^4U''(a)}\,\exp\left[\sqrt{\frac{U''(a)}{M}}\,(t_{\rm tun} - \tau)\right]. \tag{10}$$

The first term in Eq. (10) is nothing but the leading in $\hbar$ term in the energy of the ground state which cancels out for the on-shell processes. The second term is the action corresponding to the tunneling from one minimum to the other. The classical trajectory for this process corresponds to the kink with the characteristic time scale $t_{\rm tun}$. The last term in the action characterizes the corrections due to the finite size of the kink (we write it here only for the references purpose). Substituting Eqs. (3) and Eq. (4) into Eq. (1), and using the condition $\epsilon_F t_{\rm tun} \gg 1$, and asymptotic expansions (9) and (10) we obtain

$$\delta A_{e,h} = \exp\left[-\int_{-a}^{a} dx\sqrt{2M[U(x) - U(a)]}\right]$$
$$\times\left\{\nu(\mu)\left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{Tt_{tun}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(1)\right] + \frac{1}{t_{\rm tun}}\frac{d\nu(\mu)}{d\mu}\mathcal{O}(1)\right\}. \tag{11}$$

We are not discussing here if the two contributions, δA_e and δA_h, add or cancel each other (partially or completely). What we would like to emphasize is that for *each* of the two contributions the *cut-off of the logarithmic dependence of each contribution is determined only by the tunneling time.* This time exceeds inverse Fermi energy of the electrons by orders of magnitude, since the atomic mass M is much bigger than the electron mass.

In fact, this asymmetry (i.e. finite $\partial\nu/\partial\mu$) is relevant only at short times $\tau \ll t_{\rm tun}$, where the integral over τ in Eq. (1) is not logarithmic. We conclude that the origin of ultraviolet limit of the logarithm has nothing to do with the electron hole asymmetry. The smallness of the prefactor in the expression for the Kondo temperature expresses the simple fact that for the logarithmic divergence to appear in any physical property a heavy particle *must tunnel* and its tunneling time is finite, just as it was explained in Ref. 2. At times smaller than the characteristic time of tunneling, the heavy particle does not feel the two-well structure of the potential yet, and does not acquire any logarithmically divergent correction. Here we demonstrated this fact by an explicit calculation alternative to Ref. 2. The physical model used in Ref. 1 does not differ from and is the same as the one that was discussed above, of Ref. 1. For these reasons we believe that the calculation is erroneous.

The final remark of Ref. 1 that the degeneracy of the low-lying states may be “guaranteed by some local symmetry (rotational or possibly time reversal)” is also, in our opinion, irrelevant for metallic systems. Time reversal symmetry is known to guard the double degeneracy only for systems, which Hamiltonian contains a half-integer spin (Kramers degeneracy). Such a Hamiltonian leads to the regular Kondo problem and has nothing to do with the original two-level system. As to rotational symmetries, they cause no degeneracies for the ground state, because the ground state of a single atom always belongs to the *one-dimensional* representation A_1 or A of the point symmetry group.

To summarize, we disagree with the statement of Ref. 1, that the suppression of the Kondo temperature is a consequence of the electron hole symmetry. We insist that the Kondo temperature for a particle in DWP is always parametrically less than the splitting between the two lowest state. Accordingly, *the strong coupling 2CK regime never takes place in metals.*

---

[1] G. Zaránd, A. Zawadowski, cond-mat/0009283.

[2] I. L. Aleiner, B. L. Altshuler, Y. M. Galperin and T. A. Shutenko, cond-mat/0007430.

[3] D. L. Cox and A. Zawadowski, Adv. Phys. **47**, 599(1998).

[4] J. von Delft, D. C. Ralph, R. A. Buhrman, S. K. Upadhyay, R. N. Louie, A. W. W. Ludwig, V. Ambegaokar, Ann. Phys **263**, 1 (1999).

[5] G. Zaránd, A. Zawadowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 542 (1994); Phys. Rev. B **50**, 932 (1994).

[6] Yu. M. Kagan and N. V. Prokof'ev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **90**, 2176 (1986) [Sov. Phys. JETP, **63**, 1276 (1986)].